(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 4

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 11.7.90

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

54

அரசாணை எண். —
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 799

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 19-3-1891 198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

2 Sheets

அவண. கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

No 97
W.

Supg. Engineer's Office, IV Circle,
25th February 1891.

From

Lt-Col. R. R. E. Drake Brockman R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department. 799/1

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that I took the Steamer at Calicut on the 23rd October last at about 5 P.M. to inspect & report upon the erosion of sea at Cochin with reference to G. O. No 24531 dated 13th September 1890 and disembarked at 5 A.M. the following day. So my halt on board the Steamer was only half a day or about 12 hours, such being the case, I claimed daily allowance for the 24th but the Examiner has disallowed it and the Reason assigned by him is as follows:

"Finally disallowed as "Day" Reckons from Midnight to Midnight

Vide

vide C. L. R. article 29. The passage covers 23rd & 24th October 1890 and no daily allowance is therefore admissible for the 24th !!

2 I would here point out that the proviso in the same article quoted by the Examiner lays down "that a total absence from Head Quarters of less than 24 hours is not counted as two days", and this proviso apparently escaped the notice of the Examiner.

3. On the 23rd I spent only about 9 hours on board the Steamer while on the 24th I halted at Cochin on duty for 19 hours & so I consider I am entitled to daily allowance for that day as I took no meals on board on that day except a cup of tea before disembarking.

4. In these circumstances I request You will be good enough to authorize the Examiner to admit daily allowance for the 24th October 1890.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. servt.,

Ruckruh-Brockman,
Lt. Col: R.E.
Supg. Engineer, 17th Circle.

No. 1577 of 12-3-91.

To W.

The proviso referred to by Col. Drake-Brockman R.E.(Civil Service Regulations article 29) applies only for the purpose of limiting the allowance to be drawn under the articles of the Civil Service Regulations quoted therein(1154 and 1155), allowances which are dependent on the length of the absence;but in the present case, there is no question as to length of absence,the only question being whether Col.Brockman has not received some other form of travelling allowance for the day for which he claims daily allowance.

2. If the proviso applies at all in this case,the effect of it will be that Col.Brockman must be held to have been absent for one day only; but the fact will still remain that for that one day(whichever day he likes to call it,either the 23rd. or the 24th. October 1890),he drew travelling allowance in another form & daily allowance will therefore be inadmissible. Col.Brockman's claim really comes to this: he wants to treat the journey as a journey of one day with reference to the passages & as a two-day journey with reference to claims to daily allowance.

3. In my opinion the disallowance is correct.

12/3

C. M.

2887 √
P.W.C. No. 2932 √

From

The Supt Engr
4th Circle

13.9.90 - 2453 √

Dated 25th February 1891

No 97
W.

Enc:

Daily Allowance for 24th October 1890 - Requests to Authorize the Examiner P.W.A to admit the ——

S. AW

EXAMINER
No. 6-MAR91
ENCLOSURES
P. W. ACCOUNTS

No. 1171 C & 4th March 1891

To C

For remarks.

DWB
2.3.91
D.W.

(2)

No 772 dated 4th March 1891

B Hel 17 Mar

The Government agrees with the Examiner, whose disallowance is upheld.

DWB
16.3.91

D 11

S.E IV Circle √ P 19/3
Ex PWA √

Hon 16.III.91
R 17